

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

February 26, 1997

Business Meeting

MINUTES

The Board of Education and the Board of Vocational Education met for a special meeting with the Board of the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) in Conference Rooms C and D of the James Monroe Building in Richmond, Virginia, on Wednesday, February 26, 1997, with the following members present:

Board of Education

Ms. Michelle Easton, President
Mrs. Lil Tuttle, Vice President
Mr. Rayford L. Harris, Sr.
Mrs. Kay James

Mr. Robert H. Patterson, Jr.
Mr. John W. Russell
Mr. R. Lee Ware
Mrs. Cheri P. Yecke

Dr. Richard T. La Pointe
Secretary and Superintendent of
Public Instruction

State Council of Higher Education

Ms. Elizabeth McClanahan, Chair
Mr. John Padgett, Vice Chair
Mr. Jeffrey Brown

Mr. Donald Patten
Mr. George Phillips
Mr. H. Lynn Hopewell

Dr. Gordon S. Davies, Director
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia

Ms. Easton, president of Board of Education, called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance

Reverend George Conway gave the invocation and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Welcome

Ms. Easton introduced Dr. Beverley Sgro, Secretary of Education. On behalf of the Governor, Dr. Sgro welcomed everyone to the meeting. Dr. Sgro thought that this was an important event for the State Council of Higher Education and State Board of Education to meet together as a body to discuss issues of mutual concern and should be recorded in history. Dr. Sgro stated that the most significant is that both boards are working diligently to change the face of education in Virginia so every child in Virginia has an opportunity to receive an education that prepares them for a field of work, college, and a successful life as a contributing member of society.

Remarks

Ms. Easton recognized Dr. Richard T. La Pointe, State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Ms. Easton said that the number one focus of the State Board of Education has been on the academic achievement of students and schools throughout of Virginia. Three major projects the Board of Education has been working on are: Standards of Learning, new state assessments, and Standards of Accreditation.

Ms. McClanahan recognized Dr. Gordon Davies, Executive Director of State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. Ms. McClanahan said that SCHEV had attempted to reach out to all of their constituent groups and that the purpose of meeting with the State Board of Education is to discuss ways to make a better transition for students from high school to postsecondary education. Ms. McClanahan stated that as a results of the restructuring efforts that have been underway at SCHEV for a number of years there has been a savings of \$63 million and when completed a savings of \$109 million is estimated.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Report and Discussion on ABTEL (Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure) Recommendations on the New Teacher Licensure Plan

George Conway, ABTEL Chair, highlighted the major revisions contained in the report:

1. Use of the word competency to tie the competencies expected of new teachers in Virginia or those transferring into Virginia or coming into the profession from other areas and professions. These people are expected to be able to show appropriate levels of competencies tied to The Standards of Learning.

2. Reduce the number of endorsements from 104 to 49.
3. Increase the academic standards by requiring one or more concentration in core academic areas, especially in middle school education.
4. Expand technical professional license to include individuals with or without a baccalaureate degree who have shown academic proficiency and technical competency and who have completed occupational experience.

Dr. Thomas Elliott recognized the following members of the ABTEL Advisory Committee: Dr. Laura Ford, Mrs. Cheri Yecke, Ms. Patty Pitts, and Mrs. Sandy Aldridge.

Dr. Elliott reviewed the three phases of a professional preparation continuum for teachers: (1) college preparation, (2) provisional practice, and (3) continued practice.

Patty Pitts highlighted the major changes in the licensure regulations:

1. Reduce the number of endorsements
2. Align the licensure regulations with the Standards of Learning
3. Major reduction in early, elementary, and middle education.
Currently, there are seventeen different types of endorsements in these areas. The advisory board is recommending three endorsements: Early Childhood Education PreK-3, Elementary Education PreK-6 and Middle Education Grades 6-8.
4. Currently, an individual seeking endorsement in Middle Education 6-8 is required to have two areas of concentration in which those individuals must take eighteen semester hours, however the individual can teach in any of the four disciplines, even in those areas the individual has not gained an area of concentration
5. In early primary PreK-3, elementary education PreK-6, and special education, the proposal increases study in language acquisition and reading

6. Middle education 6-8 will increase the study of reading in the content area
7. The Technical Professional License, previously called the Vocational Education Certificate, will be expanded to allow individuals with or without a degree to gain that license
8. If an individual has one area of science the individual can add a second area of science with a reduced number of hours because there are some competencies stretched across all of the science areas
9. Reduce the number of endorsements in administrative supervision. Currently, there are eleven endorsements. The proposal is to collapse the endorsements into one administration and supervision endorsement and the individual will need to complete an approved program.

Sandy Aldridge said that the major changes for special education were the result of the recommendations of the State Special Education Advisory Committee and the needs heard from local school divisions.

The motion was made by Mrs. Yecke for the Board of Education to authorize the Department of Education to begin the Virginia Register of Regulations= provisions of the Administrative Process Act. Mrs. James seconded the motion and by a show of hands seven board members favored the motion. One board member, Mr. Patterson, was not available at the time the vote was taken.

Discussion of Remedial Education for Virginia High School Graduates that go to Virginia Colleges (Dr. John M. Mullen)

In 1983 SCHEV's Council appointed a task force consisting of a group of institutional representatives. The purpose of the task force was to study the issue of remediation, the role of remediation in higher education, and to assess how well it was doing. Some recommendations made by the task force were: (1) remedial education should be restricted to courses taught at the high school level; (2) courses should be restricted to the areas of math, English composition and reading; (3) community colleges should serve all high school graduates or those above the age of eighteen who show an ability to benefit from the instruction, and (4) colleges should report back to school districts. The Task Force discovered that the process of making reports back to school districts did not work which led to SCHEV working with the Department of Education staff on how to do this at a statewide level for complete reporting.

The 1993-94 report was the last report done by SCHEV. The report was used as a mechanism to give feed back to individual school districts and the State Board of Education on the performance of students enrolled in a public college or university immediately after graduation. It was intended to provide information on four characteristics: (1) the proportion of high school graduates that required a remedial course in their first year of college; (2) the percentage of graduates enrolled in colleges/universities who stayed through the spring term; (3) how well students did at the college level, and (4) graduation rate of college students.

This report was not done again because superintendents and college presidents from around the state informed SCHEV that it was not helpful in providing the following information: (1) identification of the percentage of students requiring remediation who received an academic diploma,

(2) track students as to the kinds of courses taken in high school, (3) provide clarification of how well the students did in high school, (4) include information on students that attended colleges/universities out of state or those enrolled in private institutions. They could not overcome these criticisms because there is no state level data base about high school graduates.

Mrs. Yecke requested SCHEV to get data from other states on the percentage of students that have received remedial education after high school in the southern region and if other states are using the same formula.

Mr. Harris requested that SCHEV provide a copy of the report that shows the percentage of students who have chosen their major by their first year of college.

Mrs. Tuttle encouraged SCHEV to continue this report so that the local community will have something to look at and become aware of problems that may exist in their schools.

Mrs. McClanahan said this item would go on the agenda for SCHEV's April meeting.

Report on Financial Aid - What Constitutes Satisfactory Academic Progress for Students to get Higher Education Aid (Dr. Donald J. Finley)

The state appropriates approximately \$50 million a year for grants to students to attend public colleges/universities. Appropriations are made directly to the colleges/universities and are restricted to student aid. The colleges/universities are directed in the Appropriations Act from the General Assembly on the basis of awarding money to students needing financial aid. Students must meet certain satisfactory academic progress guidelines to keep their financial aid. Satisfactory academic progress is a positive

movement toward the degree or other credentials the student is seeking. For programs that are two or more academic years in length, the students must have at least a C average or its equivalent, or academic standing consistent with the requirements for graduation at the end of the student's second year of full-time attendance, or its equivalent for part-time students.

Discussion of Academic Preparation of Virginia Students in College Prep and Vocational Program (Darlene Blake)

Tech Prep in Virginia evolved through the cooperative efforts of four state agencies: The Department of Education, the Community College System, the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia, and the Department of Labor and Industry.

The Tech Prep program is a combined secondary and minimum two-year postsecondary seamless, integrated program of study with options for work-based learning. This program has a placement component that leads to employment and/or further education, which may include a four-year degree.

Mrs. Tuttle requested the executive committee for Tech Prep to discuss the possibility of designing a state seal to be placed on high school diplomas of students who participate in the program.

Review of Virginia School-to-Work Initiative (Randy Beals)

The themes for the Virginia School-to-Work initiative are: (1) voluntary after-school Apprenticeships (or employment experiences), (2) True, full-fledged mentoring programs, (3) scholarships for postsecondary education and training, and (4) public-private partnerships for alternative education services.

Students in the School-to-Work initiatives must meet the same standards of learning as other students in Virginia who are not in a school-to-work program.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the special meeting of the Virginia Board of Education and the Board of Vocational Education and the Board of the State Council of Higher Education in Virginia adjourned at 1:55 p.m.

President